Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over JP 7-18068 to Lun<sup>1</sup>, in view of EP 0 420 564 to Endo et al and U.S. Patent No. 6,025,286 to Kawatsu, for the reasons given in the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

)

Amended Claim 1 recites that "titanium oxide is added to the polybutylene-system or polyethylene-system synthetic resin". Applicant emphasizes that the Examiner has not directly addressed in the obviousness rejection the element in Claim 1 which recites that the titanium oxide is added to the polybutylene-system or polyethylene-system synthetic resin.

In the present invention, the use of titanium oxide enhances the wear prevention of the component in which it is used. Thus, a tape cassette is provided which can prevent undesirable wear of a reel, even when the reel is rotated at high speeds. Additionally, because of the wear resistance of the present invention, the claimed configuration aids in preventing the generation of sliding resin powder and vibrations of the reel, which are caused by the wear of the reel (see page 4, lines 2-6).

In comparison, in Kawatsu, a number of materials are identified to aid in the sliding friction aspects of a polyester film. Specifically, Kawatsu discloses that clay, mica, titanium oxide, calcium carbonate, kaolin, talc or wet or dry silica, or organic particles of acrylic acid or styrene can be used to reduce sliding friction. However, there is no teaching in either Kawatsu or Endo regarding the wear of components or the generation of resin powder when a component is rotated at high speeds.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Applicants note that JP UM-B-7-18068 is incorrectly referred to as Lun in the Office Action, but should be properly referred to as Ooki or Ohki.

Because neither of the Endo or the Kawatsu references teach this aspect of the claimed invention, Applicant submits that a skilled artisan would not have found it obvious to combine the references as alleged to achieve the claimed invention. In other words, one skilled in the art would not achieve the claimed invention from the combination of Lun, Endo and Kawatsu, as Endo (EP '564) does not utilize inorganic fillers with either a polybutylene-system or polyethylene-system synthetic resin as presently claimed, and since the references to Lun and Kawatsu fail to make up for Endo's deficiency.

Further, Applicant submits that Figures 7A and 7B support the unexpectedly superior results of decreased torque and reduced wear amount in the present invention when titanium oxide is added to synthetic resin.

Figure 7A shows torque variations with respect to rotation speeds. Figure 7A shows that the holder according to the present invention with titanium oxide added to the synthetic resin, when compared with the conventional holder with no titanium oxide added, was found substantially at the same level while the rotation torque was slightly low, when the rotation speed was 2000 rpm or 3000 rpm. However, at the rotation speed of 4000 rpm, the rotation torque of the holder according to the present invention was greatly reduced over that of the conventional holder (see Figure 7A and page 18, lines 1-12).

As shown in Figure 7B, in both of the conventional holder with no titanium oxide added thereto and the holder according to the invention with titanium oxide added thereto, when the rotation speed was 2000 rpm or 3000 rpm, wear was little found. However, when the rotation speed was 4000 rpm, in the conventional holder, the wear amount of thereof increased greatly; but, in the holder according to the invention, little wear was found (see Figure 7B and page 18, lines 13-20).

Thus, the combination of Lun, Endo and Kawatsu also fails to render obvious the present invention for at least the demonstration of unexpectedly superior results.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection.

## Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

washington office 23373 customer number

Date: April 12, 2006

Registration No. 48,409